

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)

DATE: FEB 10, 2004

TIME: 10:00 A.M. TO 12:00 P.M.

LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM 2A

WEAT Members

In Attendance:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Ben Banks (a DET representative)
- Lead Technical Enterprise Architect – George Ross (a DET representative)
- Agency Enterprise Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)
- Solution Architect – Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Solution Architect – Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Solution Architect – Keith Hazelton (UW representative)

Note: Bud Borja had another meeting and needed to leave the discussion at 11:00 A.M.

DET Support Staff:

Patricia Carlson, Michelle Eldridge

Meeting Handouts:

(1) WEAT Meeting Agenda 2-9-2004; Microsoft Word Document; Author: Ben Banks.

(2) WEAT Conceptual Diagram version 2.1, PDF File, Visio Native Format, Authors: Ben Banks, Danny Proud and Patricia Carlson

Agenda Items:

- (1) Continuing Discussion of WEAT Guiding Principles
- (2) Discussion of Update WEAT Conceptual Diagram version 2.1
- (3) Deliverables for WEAT 90-day Time Frame

Update to WEAT from Ben Banks

Ben Banks update WEAT with respect to issues he was to bring forward to Matt for discussion and resolution. Due to a number of scheduling conflicts and personal issues, Matt and Ben did not have an opportunity to discuss in depth the deliverables or the charter for WEAT.

Ben did convey to WEAT that one item Matt would like to see developed by WEAT is a “matrix” that would enable WEAT to score technologies. Specifically, the matrix would plot technologies against a number of business and fiscal drivers to enable a fair, rational decision making methodology for technology selection.

Ben relayed to WEAT that Matt would be presenting an overview of EA and WEAT to the Business Leadership Council (BLC) at their meeting on Thursday 2-12-2004. Matt recognizes that a higher level abstraction of business needs is essential to support WEAT’s efforts. Therefore, the majority of the BLC meeting will be used to facilitate a discussion among agency executive management and administrative / fiscal officers within State government. The intent is to develop a listing of overlapping business and administrative functions. This list will be used as a starting point for the development of business drivers to support the EA development. Beth Hastings, the IT Management Domain Manager will be facilitating this discussion.

Ben elaborated on the role of WEAT within the context of the current IT governance framework. Ben stated that the vision is to create a highly integrated enterprise from a technology perspective. It is important that WEAT is not a “benign” entity. The intent of WEAT is to provide a common, repeatable, fair process for reviewing and recommending major technology investments.

It will be important that the Domains are aware of WEAT’s activities and that communication process is established between WEAT and the Domains so that these two entities can assist the State in making judicious technology investments.

There may be issues that arise where there is a significant difference of opinion between a Domain and WEAT. It is recognized that some sort of “arbitration” process may need to be developed to resolve conflicts between the Domains and WEAT. In the event that there is a difference of opinion and the arbitration process had not yielded any results, the Chief Information Officer would be the final decision making authority

Matt recognizes that exception process will need to be established to support specific “unusual” business needs of a program or new legislative requirement. Specific thoughts as to examples of what would require an exception process and how an exception process would work require further internal DET discussion.

Discussion of the conceptual diagram for EA Development Life Cycle

WEAT was provided with an updated version of the conceptual diagram representing the EA Development Life Cycle. Specific questions from team members included:

- (1) How does the diagram show the alignment of Business with the process of supporting the EA at multiple levels? e.g. specific business input to the CIO or TLC outside the scope of WEAT.

- (2) The diagram should illustrate that there is a high degree of interaction between WEAT and the Domains, the Domains and the TLC, WEAT and the TLC. Interaction with the Domains was discussed in regards to the development of “technology score cards” and “who would be responsible for the scoring?” With respect to who will be responsible for the scoring, the direction from the CIO is that WEAT will be responsible for the scoring. There was discussion of who would be responsible for the development of “score cards”, this will be WEAT’s role and responsibility. Please note, during the discussion of scoring several options were discussed, for example should the domains self score and forward this information to WEAT for review.
- (3) The diagram should reflect in some manner the following:
 - (A) “What” for technology decision making is the role of WEAT with input from Business Drivers, the CIO and the technology governance structure.
 - (B) “How” to support the “What” decision will be a combination of using existing processes, modifying process or developing new processes within various disciplines and organizational structures to prioritize, fund, develop/ train staff and audit decisions made for technology.
 - (C) “Where”, “When” this will be the Phases 3-5 with respect to actually implementing technology either through a “center of excellence”, some central authority or service or through an exception process. Note: the exception process will require a very well articulated business case, need to support an “exception” or a non-standard based technology implementation.
- (4) The diagram should also include in the “how” process box, “staff development”.

Based upon the input, feedback from WEAT an updated version of the conceptual diagram depicting the EA Development Life Cycle will be created. This document will be sent via email to WEAT prior to the next meeting.

Defining the “Principles” for the EA

Ben discussed the importance of clearly defining the principles for the EA as these principles will be the foundation for any “scoring mechanism” or “technology evaluation matrices”.

In general, WEAT members agree that the guiding principles for the EA should include:

- Flexibility
- Recognition of “pervasive” technologies
- Integration
- Interoperability
- Minimizing impact upon partners¹
- Adaptability
- Promote technology reuse
- Promote “technology equalization”

¹ Michelle Eldridge provided feedback to WEAT regarding the current Technology Leadership Council (TLC) Protocol regarding standards development. Specifically, Michelle stated that the protocol calls for assessing the impact, both in terms of fiscal and business processing. A copy of the governance protocol can be found at:
<http://enterprise.state.wi.us/home/tlc/TLCgovprot20031205.pdf>

A new principle of “Staff Development” was discussed and some members of WEAT felt it should be added as both a process and principle. All members of WEAT felt that “Staff Development” is extremely important. Acquiring new technology skill sets, support FTEs in furthering their professional development, ensuring that technology transfer occurs for projects in which consulting staff are used – needs to be highlighted and addressed. This topic was the focus of much discussion by WEAT members, as training is one of the first items eliminated in tight budgets. The short term tactic often has long term serious consequences for IT Directors and CIOs, as there is no way for them to enable their staff to acquire training to implement new technologies that could reap long term savings for their organizations.

Another principle was added “Alignment with Business Needs”. The development of high-quality Enterprise Architecture principles is critical to capturing the diverse business needs within the extended enterprise of State government. Specific issues that need to be addressed with respect to this principle include:

- (1) What level of abstraction will be necessary to ensure appropriate alignment with business needs?
- (2) How will the appropriate level of business needs be gathered and validated?
- (3) What entity (or entities) should “own” the process of defining the business needs?
- (4) How do we avoid using an application portfolio as fulfilling this principle?
- (5) How do we address the need for “core services”, for applications? An example cited in the meeting discussion was the Web Authentication Management System (WAMS). WAMS is a core service for the deployment of secure, user-authenticated web-based applications.
- (6) How do we include future visions and or upcoming legislative or regulatory changes as inputs for aligning with business needs?

There was general agreement that “Promoting the Sharing and Reuse of Application Code” should be a principle. Some issues that would need to be addressed to ensure success include:

- (1) Some funding mechanism to support creating a repository for sharing components, documentation on how components are used / integrated with other applications. It was also noted that the idea of “Agency Centers of Excellence” would be one way in which to facilitate the implementation of this principle within the extended enterprise. The establishing “centers of excellence” would require some initial funding from a central entity, specific legislation or other funding source.
- (2) Method to share some of the “business requirements” both in terms of what these are for a specific component and the process used to identify the business requirements.
- (3) Mechanism for an honest accurate evaluation of the match between an application requirement and an existing shared component. There was discussion on the “uniqueness” issue, in the context of entire applications, rather than components.
- (4) Sharing developed applications among the extended enterprise would require qualitative changes in support. For example there has to be consulting available associated with the shared components, this is something that is largely lacking in the current environment.

Should a principle addressing “Investment Approach” be included? The advantage of including this as a principle is that it would codify that government is being operated like a “private sector” business. It is important to note that an investment strategy at the enterprise level is inherently different from a optimized information technology service provider like the services DET currently provides to the enterprise.

Disadvantages to including this as a principle include: dilemma of IT as a business versus IT as a service and gaps can result from just an investment driven approach (specifically that at times IT can be at a different "space" from business, sometimes IT can be of a limited value to the business but has a long term strategic benefit). There was no consensus reached among WEAT that this should be a principle.

A final principle, "A Sound Foundation", was agreed to by all the members of WEAT.

Organizational Architecture and Organizational Cultural Issues

Several questions were raised by members of WEAT regarding the legislature:

- (1) How can the Fiscal Note process, owned by one of the legislative service agencies, be modified to include WEAT or use WEAT expertise in the development of Fiscal Notes with IT implications or consequences? There needs to be some mechanism whereby IT is involved earlier in the legislative process. This is so that the legislature could be presented with several IT solutions and the pro/con of each solution. Currently the legislature may not even be aware of possible alternative approaches, and so we end up with legislation that either doesn't accomplish the desired goal or which isn't the most cost effective approach to the problem it is trying to address.
- (2) How do we develop a mechanism or process to work in partnership with the legislature?
- (3) What could be done to open a dialog, exchange of information with respect to consequences of technology choices?
- (4) How could agencies work up-front with the legislature, so that they are aware of WEAT and the goals of this effort? The intent would be to gain support from the legislature for the EA

Ben led a discussion among WEAT regarding the importance of securing "buy-in" from the extended enterprise in developing the EA. Ben raised the following points for comment, input from WEAT:

- (1) It is important that individuals and organizations feel that there is a mechanism for them to voice their comments.
- (2) "Openness", several members of WEAT expressed that "openness" means that things should not happen "behind closed doors" and should not involve "lobbying" or unilateral decision-making by domain co-chairs.
- (3) "A sense of ownership" will be necessary for the EA to be embraced and incorporated within Agencies, UW and Local Units of Government.
- (4) WEAT must be perceived as being "fair", "providing equity to all" regarding the evaluation and scoring of technology.
- (5) The methodology that supports the score cards and/or matrix should be open for review and comment prior to implementation.
- (6) The decisions made by WEAT should be open to discussion (Note: This does not imply "log rolling" to change a decision, merely that questions regarding a decision may be asked).

All WEAT members made numerous comments regarding the importance of buy-in and involving the Domains and the current governance process in this effort. There was a discussion of the issue of what kind of "consequences" there ought to be if a party in the process (agency, WEAT or DET) "leaves the table" during discussions. If there are none, the

processes cannot work, because anytime anyone with sufficient power doesn't get what they want, they will simply walk away.

Assignments for Next Week's Meeting 2-17-2004

Chief Enterprise Architect and Enterprise Architect

- Questions to forward to Matt:
 - What is Matt's expectation for deliverables at the 90-day time frame ?
 - What are Matt's specific thoughts regarding the development of a decision making / technology evaluation tool? Specifically, what should this matrix contain what are the "inputs", methodology for developing the matrix?
- Issues to forward to Matt:
 - What is Matt's vision for Enterprise Architecture within the extended enterprise?
 - Does Matt have any particular "Guiding Principles" that he would like to see included or addressed?
 - How will a mechanism, process be established a mechanism to determine the "business drivers" for the EA? Will this be the role of the Business Leadership Council or some other entity within State Government?
 - Can the WEAT meeting minutes be shared?
 - How will input be obtained to develop the processes: to support implementation of the EA. The proposed processes will focus upon those outlined the EA conceptual diagram version 2.1:
 - Phase 1 Conceptual Architecture Development;
 - Phase 2 Enterprise Standards Established;
 - Phase 3 Design and Build;
 - Phase 4 Implementation; and
 - Phase 5 Maintenance and Sustainability.

WEAT members

- Review the Canadian Government's Format for their "Architecture Principles".
- Provide ideas on how to include the Domains within the EA Development Life Cycle.
- Provide options for soliciting business drivers from executive management with State agencies.
- Insights, thoughts regarding the principle "Alignment with Business Needs". Specific issues to think about include:
 - What level of abstraction will be necessary to ensure appropriate alignment with business needs?
 - How will the appropriate level of business needs be gathered and validated?
 - What entity (or entities) should "own" the process of defining the business needs?
 - How do we avoid using an application portfolio as fulfilling this principle?
 - How do we include future visions and or upcoming legislative or regulatory changes as inputs for aligning with business needs?

WEAT Support Staff.

- Prepare an agenda for 2-17-2004 meeting.
- Prepare and distribute to WEAT members a version 2.2 of the EA Conceptual Diagram based upon the meeting discussion.
- Secure a meeting room and send the new meeting location to WEAT members.
- Email WEAT members a copy of Government's Format for their "Architecture Principles". This will be used as a discussion topic within next week's meeting.
- Begin development of a web site to support WEAT's activities, communicate the work of WEAT to both technical and business/ program managers and provide reference materials regarding enterprise architecture. The target go-live date for this site is either the last week of Feb or the first week of March 2004.

WEAT Assignments: Architecture principles, Review of Arizona GITA site

-----Original Message-----

From: Jaeger, Jay
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2004 3:17 PM
To: State WEAT Support Team
Subject: WEAT Assignments: architecture principles, review of Arizona GITA site

By way of our "homework", here are some discussion points on principles of architecture and some comments regarding the Arizona GITA enterprise architecture information. (I will also be sharing this material internally and with the other large agencies).

Some Principles of architecture

Here is a stab at some principles (and areas of principles) for architecture. Most of us use these, informally, to make day to day evaluations and decisions. Most of them are "motherhood and apple pie" kinds of things. The trick will be in weighting these kinds of things.

- Flexibility (Arizona uses the term Adaptability)
 - Standards based (terms like open standards, pervasive standards and industry standards are used).
 - Portable
 - Adaptable to change, legislative initiatives, executive decisions (FYI, this was a (perhaps the primary) business requirement for DOT's DBMS, File Handler, which is still running nearly 30 years later. It has been "going away in 5 years" for the last 15 years. 8^)
 - Avoid falling into a technological backwater: avoid obsolescent technologies, vendor "lock in".
- Alignment with "business needs"
 - Concern over lack of definition and priorities that we can actually use as a measuring stick.
 - Service oriented approach: drive technology and architecture by requirements
 - Citizen service and satisfaction (and avoiding frustration) => current eGovernment trend.
 - Avoiding bureaucracy that gets in the way of good business
 - Creating business opportunities within the confines of good government practice
 - Requirements => Applications => Infrastructure (UW)
 - Sharing data (as appropriate) to avoid redundancies and inconsistencies
 - Services in support of agency missions
 - Accessibility in the face of different abilities, language skills (DWD)
 - Seek new technologies / technological trends as an opportunity to improve based on other principles, not as ends in themselves
 - System availability and reliability
- An investment approach (one could say this is alignment with business needs, but I view it as a cornerstone in its own right)

- Understanding and planning for all parts of IT system lifecycle and associated costs for all parties: design, development, deployment, support, usage, accurate assessment of lifetime timeframe and costs to decommission / replace
- Use, support staff, infrastructure costs and costs/impact upon clients and business partners are all investment factors
- Risk as a calculable cost (risk management, sharing risk broadly)
- Scalability
 - Don't redo in order to grow
 - Yet don't be afraid to make a small "throw away" investment tactically when strategic options are not suitable
- Economies of scale where appropriate
- Avoiding emotional ties to a particular technology and/or vendor
- Standards based (terms like open standards, pervasive standards and industry standards are used). ISSUE: What should Wisconsin's stance be?
- Promote sharing, re-use
 - Data, Applications, Skill Sets
 - Avoid redundant efforts
 - Center of Excellence concept?
 - Avoid redundancy except where risk avoidance dictates otherwise
 - Economies of scale where appropriate
- Data is a critical resource and a valuable resource
 - Appropriate privacy and security measures
 - Data is the grist for the application mill: applications would not exist without information
 - Good, solid, well defined security, privacy and security/privacy policy is a precursor to being comfortable sharing data and information. Inadequate security/privacy/policy is an inhibitor to sharing data.
- Governance (Organizational Architecture)
 - Good governance is based on empathy of the parties involved
 - Governance depends on real give and take, which may sometimes require "recompense" to use to make agencies "whole" when they are negatively affected by the consequences of the greater good
 - Governance can be undermined by too much authoritarian / unilateral decision making, and can also be undermined by an environment of secrecy
 - Nobody likes to get the short end of the stick all the time.
- One size does not necessarily fit all (more is not necessarily better, said the hippos as they fell from the sky onto the boat)
 - Can provide a useful starting point though
 - Comes up at a single level of government (based on agency size / capability, business lines, etc.), as well as between levels of government
 - Not all areas of the architecture should necessarily apply to all levels of government (e.g. State probably should not dictate desktop platform to local units of government)
 - Exceptions do not always weaken a standard -- they may allow a consensus to be reached where otherwise none could be reached.
- Avoid making mistakes so as to keep bad news out of the newspapers. 8^)

Arizona GITA Enterprise Architecture observations

- The architecture is well presented and well organized -- apart from the actual content
- The view of data seems insufficient in the face of the apparent mandate to share data and become more efficient
- The business view of data in the AZ documents is indirect -- via the applications -- which may not be appropriate.
- The AZ view of data modeling is dated.
- The target technologies are at too low a level for this group -- more at a level that each individual domain would tackle.
- The target technologies are slightly reminiscent of EO 242. They are quite simplistic.
- The target technologies are quite inclusive / broad, making them inadequate for providing much real guidance in making day to day choices, except in cases where the choice is already obvious.
- The use of the OSI model is somewhat quaint, and caused these technology standards to be hard to interpret / find in the document.
- The document on technology trends feels to me to be almost the antithesis of using business drivers.
- It might be a better model at a single level of government (e.g. the State agencies) than the multi-level "enterprise" that I think we are talking about.

Issues Facing WEAT

-----Original Message-----

From: Jaeger, Jay
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2004 3:18 PM
To: State WEAT Support Team
Subject: Some issues I see facing us...

Some issues that occur to me with respect to our efforts that we will need to tackle eventually:

- What should our stance be with respect to the "open source" debate? Is it important to us, are we neutral, or would we prefer a comfy relationship with a vendor.
- How important is disaster recovery / business continuity as compared to its costs? Do we want this at almost any cost? [This one is tough for domains to handle because it crosses several domains]
- I believe that our "business requirements" are not all that well defined:
 - We have some principles from the level of the Governor, but are those intended to be "first order" deciding factors, or "second order" factors to be considered when the choice isn't clear based on other principles?
 - It isn't clear to me which requirements will apply across all levels of government as opposed to which will apply to state agencies. This will frame the "one size does/doesn't fit all" discussion
 - I have concern that the actual agency business requirements are not reflected thru the BLC, only information about which requirements may not be being currently met -- which is not the same thing at all.
- Changes may require some kind of "recompense" to use to make agencies "whole" when they are negatively affected by the consequences of the greater good
- I have seen signs that the CIO wishes the enterprise architecture to provide specific guidance to state agencies (e.g., I have seen references to the server consolidation needing the results of our work). That seems to conflict with what I thought would be a higher level of abstraction of the interactions between state agencies and local units of government.

Jay Jaeger
Wisconsin DOT

Statement of Direction for Strategic IT Planning

DRAFT

From: Matt Miszewski and David Schmiedicke
To: Department Secretaries

CC: BLC
TLC

Enterprise and agency strategic business and information technology (IT) planning has contributed greatly to the success of Wisconsin government. State law requires the Department of Administration (DOA) to collect from each executive branch agency a strategic plan for the utilization of information technology to carry out their functions. **The deadline for submission of IT plans this year is March 31, 2004.** The Division of Enterprise Technology (DET) will complete an enterprise IT plan by September 15.

This year, every agency is expected to reduce costs and utilize technology to streamline operations and improve the effectiveness of providing government services. Wherever possible, agencies should utilize, develop and share administrative (back-office) systems rather than develop systems of their own. Where a business case for the development and support of new systems exists, a thorough return on investment (ROI) analysis with accompanying financing plan is required. Agencies should try to fund systems within their base budget first, then clearly identify alternative funding methods (e.g., federally funded initiatives, master lease) with hard, not soft dollars. Position requirements and reductions must also be clearly identified.

Enterprise IT planning, agency IT planning and budgeting are interdependent. An effective and comprehensive enterprise plan requires knowledge of agency activities and requirements. Conversely, agencies' strategic IT plans must take enterprise plans, directions and funding mechanisms into account. Following is a list of enterprise priorities that agencies should consider when developing their plans:

- EASI initiatives for IT systems consolidation efforts (both server consolidation as well as shared administrative systems), real estate consolidation efforts, procurement systems and human resource systems.
- Converged video and data networking.
- Directory Services replacement.
- Re-negotiation of telecommunications contracts.
- Development of an Enterprise Technology Architecture.
- Elimination of redundant or unused centrex lines and cell phones.
- Disaster recovery planning and mirrored computing centers.
- Restructuring of the computer desktop buying process.
- Developing a statewide intranet.
- Data sharing initiatives (including the Enterprise Services Bus).
- Publishing and distribution initiatives such as mail presort outsourcing, inserting consolidation, and mainframe printing.

For the statewide strategic plan to truly reflect the enterprise, it must derive from an up-to-date picture of our current environment with the enterprise data to support it. To this end, DET is

initiating an **enterprise IT inventory**. This inventory will enable decision-makers to base their plans on real data. Information on this ongoing inventory process will be forthcoming. Every effort will be made to collect this baseline data once and the effort will compliment parallel processes currently being deployed such as those involved in server consolidation.

Agency Charge:

Develop a strategic IT plan that identifies

- The agency's **business goals**;
- the agency's **current status** in the alignment of its use of IT to with the agency's own business goals and the governor's goals;
- a **vision** for how the agency will continue to align its use of technology for the next 5 years with the Governor's goals and the agency's own goals;
- a brief discussion of the **timeframe** and manner in which the agency intends to implement its IT initiatives.

Success Criteria

- As a part of the assessment of the agency's current state, the planning team must identify or create inventories of **current asset information** that can be used to develop the enterprise IT inventory discussed above.
- For a strategic plan, either business or IT, to be effective, it must be brief, comprehensive and flexible. For a strategic IT plan to be useful, **all IT initiatives** that arise in an organization must be weighed against the plan. If a new initiative still appears to be needed after being considered against the plan, the plan should be modified to include that initiative. On the other hand, if an initiative does not meet the agency's strategic goals and objectives as laid out in the plan, the agency should not move ahead with it.

We have accomplished much in the past year. We are looking forward to an even more productive few years as we continue to implement our strategic plans, both agency and enterprise.

If you have any questions about the enterprise directions and priorities or strategic planning in general, please do not hesitate to contact Beth Hastings at 267-0624. Questions about enterprise technology priority initiatives should be directed to your Technology Leadership Council (TLC) or your Business Leadership Council (BLC) member. Other questions can be directed to your DOA budget analyst/team leader.

#